RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 25 2007

Remarks

Paragraph **[0023]** has been amended to correct a typo.

Paragraphs **[0015]** through **[0017]** have been amended in order to correspond to the newly amended claims.

The claims have been slightly amended to render them clearer and to distinctly point out the invention.

Claims Rejections: 35 U.S.C. $103 (a)

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under section 103(a) of 35 U.S.C. for being allegedly rendered obvious by Chowdhurry (US 200400106393A1) in view of Hsu (US20040008632).

Applicant respectfully traverses, and submits that the relevancy of the cited prior art has been misinterpreted in view of the patentable limitations of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for setting up a prepaid quota for a prepaid subscriber in a Packet Data Access Node (PDAN), the method comprising the steps of:

a. determining by the PDAN that a connection for a prepaid subscriber, **the connection involving at least one auxiliary service instance associated with a given service option [emphasis added]**, is requested;

b. responsive to the determination, requesting by the PDAN from an Accounting Prepaid Server (HAAA/PPS) a **prepaid quota relative to the at least one auxiliary service instance [emphasis added];**

c. receiving by the PDAN the prepaid quota from the HAAA/PPS; and

d. pre-installing the prepaid quota **for the at least one auxiliary service instance [emphasis added]** in the PDAN.

Therefore, it is clear that the claimed invention deals with prepaid quotas for auxiliary service instances associated with given service options.

Auxiliary service instances are well known in the area of CDMA2000 and in cellular telecommunications in general. They are also described by the Applicant in par. **[0008] to [0010]** of the patent application. The Examiner's attention is drawn to the nature of the auxiliary service instances, as

described, and further to the prior art problems associated with the late setup of prepaid quotas as defined in the application's par. **[0013]**. Such problems are solved by the present invention as claimed, which has multiple other advantages as well. A person of ordinary skills in the art would readily recognise, upon reading the claimed limitations, the particularities of prepaid quotas in relation with auxiliary service instances.

Claim 1, for example, has multiple limitations directed to auxiliary service instances, as highlighted hereinabove. For example, in claim 1, the PDAN determines that a connection for a prepaid subscriber **involving at least one auxiliary service instance associated with a given service option,** is requested, and the PDAN from the HAAA/PPS a **prepaid quota relative to the at least one auxiliary service instance [emphasis added]**. When the PDAN the prepaid quota, the later is pre-installed **for the at least one auxiliary service instance** in the PDAN.

Auxilliary service instances and quotas associated therewith are not even mentioned, in neither one of the cited prior art references.

Chowdhurry deals with a method of controlling access to a prepaid packet data service, where a prepaid server sends a resource response in response to receipt of a request for prepaid resources from a prepaid client. The response specifies a quota for prepaid resources no greater than a prepaid account balance of the prepaid service subscriber and a resource usage threshold at which the prepaid client provides notification. Chowdhurry discloses in paragraph [0026] cited by the Examiner the involvement of an HAAA/PPS node and the transmission to the PDSN of an accept message with a prepaid capability attribute. In par. [0029], Chowdhurry teaches how a prepaid volume quota for the prepaid packet data session is computed using a RADIUS accountant request messages, and the dual use of such a volume quota with a prepaid volume threshold.

Both paragraphs cited by the Examiner, just as the entire disclosure of Chowdhurry are limited to the teaching of how the prepaid quota is computed and then assigned for the connection of the prepaid subscriber with the network. However, Chowdhurry's disclosure stops short of mentioning the division of the connection between the prepaid subscriber and the network into a main service instance and multiple auxiliary service instances, just as it is also stops short of addressing the establishment of particular prepaid quota for such auxiliary service instances.

Therefore, upon a careful reading and understanding of the limitations of the Applicant's claimed invention, it is apparent for those skilled in the art that Chowdhurry cannot be said to teach or suggests the Applicant's claimed invention.

Hsu also stops short of teaching or suggesting a division of a connection into auxiliary service instances and for the same reasons as indicated above cannot be said to teach or suggest the present invention.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is novel and nonobvious, and thus patentable over the teaching of the cited prior art. Claims 2-8 are dependent of claim 1, and since they merely add further limitations and clarifications thereto, they are believed to be patentable as well. Claims 9 and 17 are independent claims having limitations similar to those of claim 1, and are therefore submitted as being patentable for the same reasons. Claims 10-16 and 18-23 are dependent claims, and since they merely add further limitations and clarifications, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Conclusion

All pending claims 1-23 are herein submitted as being in favorable condition for allowance.

If the Examiner finds out that a prosecution of the present invention would be facilitated by telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, Alex Nicolaescu, at telephone number (514) 345– 7955.

Respectfully submitted,

Alex Nicolaescu
USPTO Reg. Number 47,253